United Nations S/PV.6165 (Resumption 1)

Security Council

Sixty-fourth year

Provisional

6165th meeting

Wednesday, 22 July 2009, 3.15 p.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Kutesa/Mr. Rugunda/Mr. Mugoya	(Uganda)
Members:	Austria	Mr. Lutterotti
	Burkina Faso	Mr. Kafando
	China	Mr. Hu Bo
	Costa Rica	Mr. Guillermet
	Croatia	Mr. Skračić
	France	Mr. Chatel
	Japan	Mr. Tsuruga
	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Mr. Dabbashi
	Mexico	Mr. Vargas
	Russian Federation	Mr. Safronkov
	Turkey	Ms. Erdoğdu
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Harvey
	United States of America	Mr. Gee
	Viet Nam	Mr. Nguyen Luu Hai

Agenda

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

09-41816 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting resumed at 3.20 p.m.

The President: I wish to remind all speakers, as I indicated at the morning session, to limit their statements to no more than five minutes in order to enable the Council to carry out its work expeditiously. Delegations with lengthy statements are again kindly requested to circulate the texts in writing and to deliver a condensed version when speaking in the Chamber.

I now give the floor to the representative of Egypt.

Mr. Abdelaziz (Egypt): At the outset, I would like to express the gratitude of my delegation for the convening of this important open debate on post-conflict peacebuilding to discuss the report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304), prepared in response to the Security Council presidential statement of 20 May 2008 (S/PRST/2008/16), and I would like to extend my thanks and gratitude to the Secretary-General for presenting his report.

As I am sure that the Council presidency and members are aware, the first part of my intervention will be on behalf of both Egypt and Ireland, the co-chairs of the meeting entitled "Post-Conflict Peacebuilding: Contemporary Challenges and the Way Forward", convened by the Governments of Egypt and Ireland in Cairo on 18 and 19 May 2009. The meeting touched on many of the issues contained in the report of the Secretary-General under consideration today.

Egypt and Ireland took the initiative to convene the Cairo meeting to engage senior officials from all regional groups in a discussion on the contemporary challenges and opportunities in peacebuilding and on possible solutions to those challenges. The Cairo meeting took place against the backdrop of emerging lessons and experiences in peacebuilding from the four countries on the agenda of the Peacebuilding Commission: Burundi, Sierra Leone, Guinea Bissau and the Central African Republic, as well as other countries emerging from conflict. Another important factor for the meeting was the forthcoming review of the Peacebuilding Commission, Peacebuilding Support Office and the Peacebuilding Fund in 2010, in accordance with the founding resolutions of the Commission.

The meeting emphasized the importance of addressing the underlying social and economic causes of crises, enhancing coordination and cooperation among regional organizations and institutions and donor countries, and assuring the significance of national ownership and the need to build confidence at the subnational level. The importance of capacity-building — which should be country-specific and tailored to the needs of the country in question — was underscored, as was the need to build institutional capacity, particularly outside of the capitals, and the need for international actors to reduce the administrative burden on local actors.

It was also highlighted that there should be an effective and coherent international response to peacebuilding, coordinated by the United Nations, and that the United Nations must not be a substitute for the Government in exercising its functions and responsibilities, but should support and strengthen the Government's capacity to effectively address the challenges it faces.

Participants stressed the role of the Peacebuilding Commission and the important role of the World Bank, the United Nations Development Programme and other partnerships with the United Nations. They addressed the lack of consistent international support and funding in critical areas, the need for more simplified donor procedures that would enable quick gains and more flexible funding, would reduce time frames for disbursement of funds and would encourage diaspora remittances.

The meeting also highlighted the important role of regional organizations in supporting peacebuilding efforts, both in terms of political support and in developing regional peacebuilding capacities. It emphasized that the United Nations should continue to strengthen partnerships and create greater synergies with regional organizations to better support countries emerging from conflict. It was recognized that some regional organizations lacked the appropriate capacity to play their potential role, and donor organizations were therefore encouraged to support them.

In that regard, I would like to inform the Council of Egypt's initiative to strengthen the peace and security structure of the African Union within the framework of the European Union-African strategic partnership. The aim of this initiative is to operationalize and develop the post-conflict

reconstruction and development framework of the African Union through the establishment of a regional centre in close institutional collaboration among the African Union, the United Nations and other international and regional organizations.

In general, the Cairo meeting provided a valuable opportunity for Member States to discuss and exchange views on matters of crucial concern, and we — Egypt and Ireland — are glad to see that many of those elements were taken into consideration in the preparation of the report of the Secretary-General.

Commenting in my national capacity on the report of the Secretary-General, I would like to commend the Secretary-General and his team for preparing the comprehensive report and to express Egypt's support for the ideas and conclusions reflected therein, in particular the emphasis on strengthening national capacity and ensuring that it is part of an entry strategy and not merely the basis for an exit strategy, the necessity of respecting the principle of national ownership, and that peacebuilding efforts must be anchored at the country level, with support and guidance from the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council, the Security Council, the Peacebuilding Commission, the United Nations system at large and Member States. It is national leaders who can ensure that vision, strategy and decision-making respond effectively to the realities on the ground. Therefore, the United Nations is expected to play a leading role in the field, by facilitating engagement between national and international actors and among international actors, without prejudicing the role of the Peacebuilding Commission.

While we agree with the agenda set by the Secretary-General in the report to strengthen the United Nations contribution to a more rapid and effective response in the immediate aftermath of conflict, there is still a need for clarification concerning some of the issues reflected.

First, the report gives the impression that the Security Council is the major player when it comes to peacebuilding efforts in the immediate aftermath of conflict — for example, paragraph 14. At that time the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council should play an equal role. Secondly, all aspects of the matters of the pool of civilian experts and the standing capacities should be further discussed in detail. I propose in that regard that the Secretary-General present a comprehensive report, which could be used as basis for discussions among Member States. Thirdly, enhancing the United Nations leadership team on the ground and the steps undertaken by the Secretary-General, as enshrined in the report, to strengthen the accountability of the Special Representatives are matters that need further discussion and elaboration.

Fourthly, the section of the report relating to the role of the Peacebuilding Commission did not include specific proposals aimed at strengthening the role of the Commission through making it more flexible and efficient in the immediate aftermath of conflict, rather than recommending that the Security Council consider how the advice of the Peacebuilding Commission could contribute to its work during the early phase of the Council's consideration of a situation. That recommendation, though it could lead to increasing the role of the Peacebuilding Commission, could, on the other hand, also lead to increasing the domination of the Council over the work of the Commission vis-à-vis the role of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. Thus, there is a need to further discuss that proposal to ensure that it will not affect the institutional balance between the principle organs of the Organization.

Fifthly, there should be a clear understanding of the interrelationship between peace consolidation activities in the immediate aftermath of conflict, particularly the relationship between peacekeeping and peacebuilding, from all aspects, including the financing of those activities.

In conclusion, my delegation would like to express our appreciation to you, Mr. President, for convening this meeting and to the Secretary-General for presenting his valuable report, with the wish that the United Nations would benefit from it through strengthening its response in the immediate aftermath of a conflict.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Burundi.

Mr. Gahutu (Burundi) (*spoke in French*): It is a pleasure and great honour for me to take the floor before the Council for a discussion on the report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding after a conflict (S/2009/304). I wish the President of the Council every success. I also welcome and congratulate the Secretary-

General and thank him for the relevant, wise and diverse advice given in his report.

Given that my country is emerging from a conflict that lasted more than decade, our Government fully supports the guiding principles set out in the report. Although all these principles are closely linked and interdependent, my delegation stresses the importance of some in particular, beginning with the principle of national ownership.

Peacebuilding efforts belong essentially to the countries concerned. The United Nations and the international community should play a catalytic support role in that respect, and contribute to strengthening national capacity as soon as a ceasefire agreement has been signed.

With respect to leadership, we endorse the Secretary-General's proposal to create a high-level mechanism to ensure good United Nations leadership on the ground and to support country teams.

With respect to coherence, restoring, keeping and building peace and post-conflict reconstruction should go hand in hand. That will require the participation of all entities of the United Nations system.

Following a conflict, challenges are always immense and varied. Each situation has its own specific features, and the means for establishing peace are very different in each instance and each area. This debate is taking place at a time when the peacebuilding process in Burundi has seen significant progress in most areas, which is likely to stabilize the country once and for all. We note, for instance, the establishment of the Independent National Electoral Commission; the comprehensive implementation of the political agreements between the Government and the former rebel movement Parti pour la libération du peuple Hutu-forces nationales de liberation, which is now a political party; the commitment of the Government of Burundi to a policy to demobilize and reintegrate repatriated persons; and other examples.

In the area of good governance, the culture of dialogue between national partners is being promoted through sessions and workshops throughout the country.

In the area of security, the professionalization of the defence and security forces and the disarmament of civilians continue.

The regional dimension of security has not been neglected. The ministers of defence of the countries of the Economic Community of the Great Lakes Countries recently reaffirmed their determination to fight the negative forces at work in the subregion and to guarantee the security of our common borders.

With respect to the rule of law and the fight against impunity, my delegation is pleased to announce that consultations with a view to implementing transitional justice began on 14 July. The settlement of land disputes continues, and the Government has adopted a national land policy and a new land code adapted to the current situation.

In the light of the challenges ahead, the peacebuilding process in Burundi requires additional inputs with respect to our priority peacebuilding plan. Many imponderables, including the world financial, energy and food crises, have called all our initial financial forecasts into question. The Government of the Republic of Burundi is still awaiting the implementation of the "Marshall plan" for Burundi proposed by the Peacebuilding Commission last year, requests once again the disbursement of funds pledged by its partners at the roundtable of May 2007, and thanks those that have already honoured their commitments.

The Strategic Framework for Peacebuilding in Burundi is under way, uniting the Government, the Peacebuilding Commission and national and international partners around a set of common peacebuilding objectives. In general, current trends, achievements and commitments reveal that sound progress has been made in all areas related to peacebuilding. Burundi once again thanks the Secretary-General for his report and his ongoing support for the peacebuilding process in my country.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Canada.

Mr. McNee (Canada): I thank you, Sir, for convening this important debate. Let me also join others in thanking the Secretary-General for his important report (S/2009/304) and warmly welcome his personal commitment to peacebuilding. I should also like to thank the representatives of the United Nations Development Programme and the World Bank for their insightful contributions earlier in the day.

Canada has a long history of contributing to United Nations peacekeeping and peacemaking. That underpins Canada's strong commitment to peacebuilding, which is also reflected in Canada's chairing the country-specific configuration of the Peacebuilding Commission on Sierra Leone.

In that vein, we welcome the Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict as an important step forward for peacebuilding at the United Nations. The report is a call to action that points to areas in which the United Nations and the international community have been either unresponsive or disjointed.

Over the past decade, the international community has come to recognize that the fragility of States in the immediate aftermath of crisis represents both a central development challenge and a potential threat to global stability. Failure to adequately address the early recovery needs of fragile States threatens to deepen poverty, increases the risk of a relapse into violence, and poses real threats to regional and international stability.

At the same time, attention to the early recovery agenda does not and must not occur in a vacuum. In this regard, it is significant that this debate comes after the recent publication of the Secretary-General's report on conflict mediation (S/2009/189) and during ongoing discussions about the future of United Nations peacekeeping.

The benefits of investing in peacebuilding are increasingly clear, and Sierra Leone is an excellent example of the real progress that is possible when the international community works in unison to support strong national leadership.

Peacebuilding is a complex, multifaceted task. While the focus of peacebuilding will vary from case to case and across time, the key pillars remain the same. The first is restoring the capacity of the State to provide public goods to its citizens, including justice and the rule of law, basic social services and an enabling economic environment. The second is rebuilding the legitimacy of the State by ensuring the democratic accountability of political leaders to their citizens. The third challenge is to bring about social reconciliation through proactive efforts to heal the wounds left by conflict. Fourthly, rapid economic revitalization must provide jobs and a future to weary populations and ex-combatants. The final and perhaps most important component is visionary political leadership that puts the interests of the country and its people above all else.

Given this context, the report's critical contribution is to emphasize cooperation, coordination and coherence. International actors must pursue common priorities based on an agreed assessment of the situation and a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities. Special effort must be made with the World Bank to clarify respective responsibilities for core peacebuilding sectors. Strengthening leadership teams in the field is an important step towards improving the United Nations contribution. Canada is also encouraged by the emphasis placed on the Post-Conflict Needs Assessment as a unified and inclusive assessment tool.

Establishing durable peace and prosperity is difficult without a functioning State. Building peace is the primary responsibility of national actors. Canada welcomes the recommendations of the report to urge an initial assessment of existing national capacity, bolster capacity for development efforts, and support national oversight of international assistance. Canada also urges peacebuilding actors to consider how the expertise resident in diaspora communities can be better mobilized during post-conflict recovery. During this critical period, more can be done to utilize the strengths of regional organizations, and to encourage greater South-to-South cooperation in support of peacebuilding.

This raises an important issue, that is, timely access to effective technical assistance. The Secretary-General's report (S/2009/304) offers useful recommendations for improving support to United Nations personnel in the field. Existing experience with models such as the Standing Police Capacity, the Mediation Support Unit, and the Justice Rapid Response mechanism should also be applied to other areas of need. Closer cooperation with regional and subregional organizations also offers great promise. The international community should also re-examine how bilateral and multilateral civilian response mechanisms such as expert rosters can be better coordinated and respond more quickly to crises.

(*spoke in French*)

The Secretary-General has identified core peacebuilding objectives, including support for basic

security, political processes, essential services, governance and economic revitalization.

Questions of transitional justice and national reconciliation are central for post-conflict peacebuilding. Local populations must have access to formal and informal structures that facilitate communal healing and address abuses committed during the conflict. An effective justice system is also critical for fostering accountability, building trust in national institutions and establishing basic security. Above all, international assistance must help establish legal institutions that embrace transparency and respect for human rights. In this respect, Canada warmly welcomes the report's emphasis on the full participation of women and children in the peacebuilding process and on the protection of their human rights.

Improved financing is crucial. The creation of the Peacebuilding Fund was an important step in this area, and work is also under way in the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), to clarify best practices in post-conflict assistance. Canada also welcomes both the recent revision of the Peacebuilding Fund terms of reference and the Secretary-General's recommendations for the Fund. Rapid and flexible financing now may help prevent the need for more expensive interventions later.

The report also has significant implications for the Peacebuilding Commission. In our opinion, the Commission remains underutilized, and it is important to reconsider its role in the immediate post-conflict period. Greater ambition with respect to the nature and scope of the work of the Commission is warranted. The Commission has the potential to be a central and effective actor with respect to the prioritization, coordination and support of peacebuilding strategies. We should not be willing to settle for less.

In conclusion, it is now up to the United Nations system to implement the recommendations in the report. It will be important to provide regular updates to Member States on progress being made. In other areas — notably national capacity-building, civilian rapid response and financing — Member States must also take the lead. As a committed member of the Peacebuilding Commission and a major donor to the Peacebuilding Fund, Canada stands ready to support these efforts.

The President: I now call on the representative of Sweden.

Mr. Lidén (Sweden): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The candidate countries Turkey, Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the countries of the stabilization and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia, as well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova and Armenia, align themselves with this statement.

Let me begin by thanking the Secretary-General for his timely report (S/2009/304).

During the past decade, the international community has increasingly been called upon to prevent States from collapsing, fracturing or falling back into conflict. The task we are confronted with is often that of assisting in building functioning State structures in areas torn by political strife and the legacy of violence. Over the years we have learned important lessons, and the report of the Secretary-General provides an opportunity to further strengthen the peacebuilding capacity of the United Nations. Many of its important recommendations need to be urgently implemented. We look forward to the Secretary-General's continued engagement and to his commitment to this important agenda.

The report rightly focuses on the immediate aftermath of conflict. We know from experience that this is a particularly vulnerable and critical phase of peacebuilding, characterized by fragile security conditions, severe humanitarian and human rights needs and significant political uncertainty. For the international community, it is a phase where our ability to deliver assistance is put to a difficult test.

While a basic level of security is vital to achieving peaceful development, all aspects of peacebuilding must be considered from the beginning of the process. The successful disarmament and demobilization of former combatants requires a framework in which those people can be reintegrated. Alongside the deployment of peacekeepers, efforts must be made to stimulate economic recovery, support the provision of basic services and restore the rule of law, good governance and respect for human rights.

The central challenge is to build the structures of functioning State institutions. That process requires the

participation of all relevant stakeholders. National ownership is essential, as underlined in the Secretary-General's report. Special efforts should be made to reach out to women, youth and minority groups at risk of exclusion.

A coherent strategy among international actors in field operations is crucial in order to effectively support national processes. Unfortunately, such coherence is often lacking. The European Union supports the Secretary-General's recommendation on the need for an effective and accountable United Nations leadership on the ground, empowered to lead immediate international efforts in support of national authorities. A common set of priorities is necessary to bridge the gap between early stabilization and recovery efforts and longer-term development planning. Mechanisms for more effective monitoring, evaluation and adjustment of strategies also need to be developed.

The European Union welcomes the emphasis in the report on joint needs assessment, planning and support. Ways must now be found to put this into practice. We look forward to the recommendations on the integrated task forces and on Headquarters support to Resident Coordinators and United Nations country teams.

We echo the Secretary-General's call for greater clarity on the roles and responsibilities of core peacebuilding actors, both within the United Nations and between the Organization and the World Bank and other international actors. Those designated as lead agencies bear a special responsibility to make the appropriate investments in order to provide timely and predictable support. Those arrangements should be subject to regular review.

We have been encouraged by the positive assessment of the Standing Police Capacity and would welcome the further development and expansion of rapidly deployable civilian capacities to other areas pertaining to the rule of law. We look forward to the proposed overall review on how the United Nations can help broaden and deepen the pool of civilian experts, particularly from affected regions and from the South. In that context, the European Union would also like to stress the important role of women in peacebuilding, as outlined in resolution 1325 (2000).

The Peacebuilding Commission has existed for three years. It is unique in its membership structure, its involvement of civil society and its country-specific approach. The strategic potential of the Commission lies in its ability to stimulate coordination, mobilize resources, maintain a spotlight on countries emerging from conflict and provide advice to all relevant bodies of the United Nations system. As suggested by the Secretary-General, the European Union would like to see the Commission's advice be more proactively considered. The 2010 review will offer an important opportunity to learn from the first years of operation and to make appropriate improvements. It is also essential that the Peacebuilding Support Office be utilized to its full potential. To that end, the role of the Office should be clearly defined.

Access to timely and flexible funding is often one of the main challenges to maintaining the momentum in a peace process immediately after the conclusion of a peace agreement. The European Union welcomes the Secretary-General's recognition of the need to strengthen the role of the Peacebuilding Fund in the early stages of peacebuilding. We must strive towards a Peacebuilding Fund that sets an example by providing seed funding to bridge the gap between conflict and recovery at a time when other funding mechanisms may not yet be available.

Over the past decade, the European Union has gradually enhanced its capacity to support efforts to secure peace in war-torn areas around the world. Today, the European Union is one of the main contributors to peacebuilding activities, working closely with the United Nations, the African Union and other actors in those efforts. The continued strengthening of those partnerships, particularly with the United Nations, is a key priority for the European Union.

The report of the Secretary-General provides many useful recommendations for strengthening the peacebuilding capacity of the United Nations. It is fully in line with the appreciated efforts of the Secretary-General to enhance the overall coherence, effectiveness and accountability of United Nations operations in the field. The European Union is committed to supporting that agenda for change in all relevant intergovernmental forums as well as at the country level.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of New Zealand.

Mr. McLay (New Zealand): New Zealand joins others in thanking you, Mr. President, for convening

this special debate. We also thank the Secretary-General for his report (S/2009/304) on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict — a report that confirms the critical role of the United Nations in addressing the many gaps in the international response to conflict situations.

The report rightly focuses on the critical period immediately after conflict, when virtuous cycles must be set in motion to lay foundations for lasting peace. So often, however, we have failed in that, with nearly 30 per cent of all conflicts that ended in negotiated settlement resuming within five years.

Time is of the essence in the immediate post-conflict period. A fragile peace can quickly unravel if peace dividends are not quickly apparent. The availability of expert teams that can deploy and begin work at very short notice is an essential bridge to a fuller and more coordinated response.

The pace of deployment to missions such as the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur, where less than 35 per cent of international civilian posts had been filled a year after its establishment, and the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic and Chad, which had first-year vacancies of 91 per cent, is of great concern. Those are stark and depressing numbers. They help make the case for civilian stand-by capacity and for United Nations human resources management reform.

We were pleased that the report also acknowledges that the United Nations must improve its coordination, both internally and with national and international actors. The delivering as one philosophy must underpin United Nations peacebuilding efforts, just as it must in any other area. United Nations country leaders — the people on the ground — need greater powers and support from Headquarters to achieve their most immediate, and invariably urgent, objectives. Competent appointees, with well-defined delegations given the freedom to act quickly and decisively, could save lives, save time and save infrastructure and institutions essential to the peacebuilding process.

The report also recognizes the need for rapid assessments to determine both existing capacity and the most immediate demands for external support. Capacity development, where it is needed, should not be part of an exit strategy; it should begin straight away.

New Zealand follows the work of the Peacebuilding Commission with considerable interest. Its composition, objectives and working methods offer significant promise. But, despite that, we have yet to see concrete results. We therefore welcome the Secretary-General's consideration of how it might better realize its potential, including channelling its resources and promoting greater coherence.

New Zealand favours an integrated approach to addressing the underlying causes of conflict, with the participation of security, diplomatic, development and local actors. We commend the report for emphasizing the importance of local context in developing a peacebuilding strategy.

New Zealand has been a significant contributor to peacebuilding activities that have made a tangible difference on the ground. The Regional Assistance Mission to Solomon Islands promotes long-term stability, security and prosperity by supporting improved rule of law, more effective, accountable and democratic government, economic growth and enhanced public-service delivery. We also adopt an integrated whole-of-government approach to our contributions in Timor-Leste and Afghanistan.

The image of the Blue Beret interposed between previously warring parties has become one of the Organization's successes. But the benefits of peacekeeping, ceasefires and truces can be quickly lost without the next stage, namely, that of peacebuilding, which makes short-term peace sustainable by fostering democracy, leadership, justice, reconciliation, human rights and economic and social development.

New Zealand is committed to working with the United Nations and others to ensure more durable solutions to preventing future conflict. The United Nations must remain as committed to peacebuilding as it is to peacekeeping. One is immediately important to end conflict and save lives; the other is absolutely necessary to prevent the resumption of conflict and to rebuild lives and societies. History will judge not only how we achieved the first, but also how we sustained the second.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Australia.

Mr. Quinlan (Australia): I thank you very much, Mr. President, for the opportunity to speak today on

this vitally important topic. I know that the time is short, so I will summarize my statement.

Australia welcomes the report (S/2009/304) of the Secretary-General, as have others today. Post-conflict peacebuilding is a key challenge of our time. The Secretary-General's leadership is critical to advancing United Nations efforts to address that challenge. His report provides important guidance to all our efforts to improve our response in the aftermath of conflicts.

We fully endorse the principle that peacebuilding following a conflict is the responsibility of the Government of the affected country. There must be local ownership of all efforts. At the same time — and this is not a contradiction — stronger and better-resourced United Nations leadership on the ground will result in better outcomes for the partner country. To improve analysis, planning and coordination, for example, the role of the resident coordinator's office should be strengthened. We also welcome the recognition that there should be a commensurate increase in the accountability of senior United Nations leadership.

We need to recognize the importance of the security-development nexus and to ensure an integrated approach among the various mission elements. We would argue that the importance of effective civil-military-police relations needs to be a key consideration for those taking leadership roles in missions and also in the training and preparedness of deployed civilians.

We welcome the report's acknowledgement of the role that local and traditional authorities and civil society have in recovery and development. Australia's experience in the Pacific, like New Zealand's, has demonstrated the importance of supporting traditional leadership — including those outside the formal State apparatus — in recovery efforts.

We also welcome the report's emphasis on the needs of women and girls. The early post-conflict period provides an opportunity to consolidate new leadership and employment roles that may have been taken on by women during the period of the conflict.

In terms of the international architecture, Australia welcomes the enhanced cooperation framework recently agreed between the World Bank and the United Nations.

With regard to deployable civilian capabilities, we in Australia are in the process of developing such a capability. We look forward to cooperating with the United Nations and others in undertaking a comprehensive review of how to broaden and deepen the pool of civilian experts and improve their interoperability.

In conclusion, I should to thank you again, Mr. President, for the opportunity to participate in this debate, to reiterate our gratitude to the Secretary-General for the important report that has brought all together and for the valuable ideas that he has shared with us, and finally, to underline our willingness to keep working to improve all our efforts in this area.

Mr. Gutiérrez Reinel (Peru) (*spoke in Spanish*): I should like at the outset to highlight the fact that the Security Council scheduled this open debate on post-conflict peacebuilding shortly after the recent submission of the report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304) to the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission and, in particular, shortly after the conclusion of the high-level Conference on the World Financial and Economic Crisis and Its Impact on Development.

That timing is significant because Peru believes that, in the current context of financial crisis, we must make efforts to prevent peacebuilding processes from being affected. We must do everything possible to ensure that early recovery processes in post-conflict States are maintained and, in this context of crisis, even strengthened. It is well known that those processes face a range of problems that hamper their implementation, such as the lack of infrastructure in countries benefiting from cooperation and the lack of trained cooperation personnel owing to the working and security conditions in post-conflict countries, as well as the slow distribution of funds.

From that perspective, my delegation considers that there are a number of steps that should be taken immediately to strengthen the current peacebuilding processes. These include placing priority on improving the institutional capacity of Governments. That is fundamental, because national actors are the real protagonists in developing the work and the implementation of peacebuilding processes.

With regard to the very nature of conflicts, notwithstanding certain similarities in the economic

and social factors that may be observed in some, every conflict has its own internal and external dynamics, as well as its own ethnic, tribal, constitutional or historical referents. That means that no two cases or relevant groups of actors are alike — hence the complexity and great sensitivity of the management and design of strategies for peacebuilding processes.

Therefore, such processes require designs that improve the division of labour so as to promote effective management in the implementation of projects, the greater involvement of women as important actors in any process, and a diffusion of decision-making throughout the structures of cooperating organizations in order to ensure better effectiveness in project implementation.

Such clear and concrete measures would strengthen the management capacities of all actors involved in peacebuilding processes. In particular, they would help to attain an objective that is an integral part of peacebuilding processes — strengthening the institutionality of the State. As we have seen, that is a process whose aspects are two sides of the same coin and thus interconnected. Therefore, actions should be aimed at promoting both the peacebuilding process and the State-building process, not only simultaneously but in parallel.

In such an exercise it is important, in the light of the prognosis set out in the report of the Secretary-General, that a series of actions be taken to effectively bridge the strategic gap between weak institutional capacities and delayed project financing, without neglecting work in three areas that have a direct bearing on the peacebuilding and the State-building processes — governance, security and development — seeking a fair balance that avoids giving one area pre-eminence over another.

With respect to international cooperation, my delegation believes that, as a matter of priority, it should be channelled towards strengthening the political system and conflict settlement, the training of civilian teams and the design and implementation of projects that will have a swift social impact, which is crucial in order to gain the support of the local population. To that end, financial institutions, including the World Bank in particular, are natural allies in peacebuilding efforts and essential to their success.

All of this involves a medium- and long-term commitment, with the participation of the international community and the full agreement of the State concerned. It may be of several years' duration, in many priority areas and, in some cases, quite far-reaching. A strategic vision of the peacebuilding process is required to that end. It is thus essential to build an alliance among the political, social, educational and economic powers of the State and the relevant international actors.

To the society involved in peacebuilding processes, it should be made clear that international cooperation is aimed at strengthening the exercise of its sovereignty, with full respect for international law and the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, but that such cooperation has a time frame and must follow an agenda with clearly defined objectives and specific goals that will ensure its viability.

I should like to conclude by highlighting the important work accomplished thus far by the Peacebuilding Commission, by reaffirming Peru's constructive support for the leadership of the United Nations and the Commission in the work being done in peacebuilding processes, and by emphasizing my country's full readiness to contribute decisively to those efforts.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Morocco.

Mr. Loulichki (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): Today's Security Council debate on post-conflict peacebuilding is of crucial importance; the subject merits follow-up and further comprehensive work. It is significant, Sir, that this debate is taking place under the presidency of a noble son of our continent, Africa, which continues to be a stakeholder in international peacebuilding efforts.

The recent report of the Secretary-General on this theme (S/2009/304) contains reflection, analysis and forward thinking about how to fill the gaps and make United Nations efforts more effective and better adapted to the needs of countries affected by conflict. Let me draw four fundamental elements from this rich report which in my delegation's view are of particular importance.

First, peacebuilding efforts should be launched as soon as a peace agreement is signed and should be integrated into the implementation of peacekeeping

operations. Such an approach would enable the international community to respond in good time to the priorities of countries emerging from conflict, help those countries to implement the peace agreements they have signed, create peace dividends that can calm populations and help restore trust.

Secondly, national ownership — encompassing both Government and civil society — of the peacebuilding process is fundamental. When the Government or authorities of a country emerging from conflict takes ownership of the process of defining and implementing peacebuilding strategies, it becomes engaged and takes responsibility for the success or failure of the process. But national ownership, however necessary, is not enough. The contribution of the international community is also needed, including that of the international financial institutions, through financial and technical assistance and capacity-building.

Thirdly, there is a need for predictable, rapid and flexible financing for the implementation of peacebuilding strategies. Here, we hope that the recent review of the terms of reference of the Peacebuilding Fund will make it possible to ensure flexibility and speed in the timely disbursement of funds, as well as their optimal utilization.

Fourthly, the international community's activities in the field require coherence and coordination, with a view to producing the desired outcome. In that regard, the competencies and experience that the United Nations has gained in this sphere enable the Organization to assume a leadership role in channelling international action that responds to the needs of the society in question.

I said that I would mention four elements, but a fifth is extremely important as well: the role of regional actors in the creation of conditions conducive to peacebuilding in countries emerging from conflict. You, Mr. President, are well placed to see the very valuable contributions made by neighbouring countries and regional groupings. Experience continues to show that the contributions of neighbouring countries and regional or subregional groupings can make or break a peacebuilding endeavour. The special contribution of such regional actors is extremely important: they should be involved in a constructive way, to bring about peace, stability and regional cooperation.

The report of the Secretary-General rightly emphasizes the importance of economic recovery, which should be integrated into other peacebuilding tasks such as security sector reform; rule of law, including the protection of human rights; bolstering State authority; and transitional justice.

In conclusion, I stress the important role of the Peacebuilding Commission. I have been participating in its work for some eight months, and I have seen the tremendous work the Commission is doing; it is pragmatic and invaluable for the countries concerned. Since it became operational, the Commission has played an extremely important role by designing integrated peacebuilding strategies, adopting a country-specific approach to the States on its agenda, promoting integrated strategies and mobilizing resources. The role of the Peacebuilding Commission should be enhanced and better integrated into the architecture of the United Nations system and its partners, including through the promotion of regular interaction and productive cooperation between the Commission and the Security Council.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Germany.

Mr. Matussek (Germany): I would like to join my colleagues in thanking the Secretary-General for his timely and valuable report (S/2009/304). I would also like to thank the Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission, Ambassador Muñoz, for his very comprehensive briefing.

Germany fully supports the statement of the European Union presidency to be made by the representative of Sweden later and shares its analysis of peacebuilding challenges.

Today more than ever, the international community is facing the challenge of supporting post-conflict countries on their way back to sustainable peace and stability. It is often said that winning peace is almost as difficult as winning a war. The fact that 30 per cent of countries fall back into conflict within five years of a peace agreement underlines the magnitude of this challenge.

The report provides an excellent road map for the way ahead with its numerous recommendations. I would like to focus my statement on three particularly important challenges.

The first issue at stake is national ownership. National ownership is key to all peace building efforts. However, in the immediate aftermath of a conflict, national ownership cannot be taken for granted. There are often insufficient national capacities to fully enable the country to exercise its ownership. Therefore, it is vital to strengthen the national capacity to re-establish the institutions of Government, restore the rule of law, provide basic services and handle other key peacebuilding needs. We also must support the national authorities by establishing a prioritized early strategy to address the causes of each particular conflict.

Secondly, there is need for effective and accountable senior United Nations leadership on the ground. This is a prerequisite to corral the international assistance behind the early national strategy. Thereby we can provide timely and predictable support. To achieve a comprehensive and coherent approach we will need a clear division of labour and responsibilities among the various actors. In particular, we must strive for close coordination between the United Nations and the World Bank.

Finally, there is the timing of international support. We need to rapidly and efficiently lay the groundwork for durable peace and sustainable development. To that end, it is essential for peacebuilding efforts to start as early as possible after a conflict, if possible alongside peacekeeping efforts. The new terms of reference for the Peacebuilding Fund provide enhanced opportunities for faster and more flexible funding for peacebuilding activities in the crucial moments directly after a conflict.

Germany will, in particular, strengthen its national capacities to contribute to international peacebuilding missions. We will also support efforts within the framework of the United Nations and regional organizations to increase the rapidity and efficiency of our response to conflicts.

We look forward to a strengthened role for the Peacebuilding Commission in tackling the challenges ahead. The comprehensive review in 2010 will provide a good opportunity to discuss the Peacebuilding Commission's future role and activities.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Guatemala.

Mr. Rosenthal (Guatemala) (*spoke in Spanish*): Let me begin, Sir, by expressing my thanks for the opportunity to participate in this open debate which you have convened in such a timely fashion to address the question of post-conflict peacebuilding. This issue is relevant to us, in view of our own experiences since the signing of our Peace Agreements in 1996, with a significant United Nations presence. I wish also to express my thanks to the Secretary-General, Mr. McKechnie of the World Bank and Ambassador Heraldo Muñoz, for their presentations, which have undoubtedly enriched this debate.

We welcome the Secretary-General's emphasis on the importance of national ownership, the central idea of his report (S/2009/304). This recognition is, in our view, essential since a firm and lasting peace agenda can be executed only when the main national actors find in it a minimal agenda for compromise and consensus.

At the same time, we find useful the commitment undertaken to promote a coherent and efficient response by the United Nations system. In this regard, we believe it is important to make use of the full potential of the Peacebuilding Support Office, and, to this end, we concur in the importance of clearly defining its role, taking into account the complementarity that it could offer to other Secretariat bodies.

We believe that equal attention needs to be given to the fact that the broader support from bilateral donors and non-governmental organizations should be coherent, coordinated and sustained, and above all complementary to the efforts to build confidence in the peace process. That is particularly critical and there is a need to prevent such support from exacerbating the causes of conflict or from generating new sources of tension, as has happened on some occasions in the past.

As regards the proposal on predictable international assistance, we welcome the Secretary-General's commitment to create new systems for recruitment of personnel from neighbouring regions, from countries with similar socio-economic, cultural or linguistic structures, or that have already undergone a process of post-conflict transition.

We appreciate the ideas put forward for an enhanced capacity for rapid deployment of personnel, although this proposal seems complex to us because of the costs that it might involve in terms of keeping professional staff on permanent standby, especially for developing countries. We trust that the proposed

review and the information provided by the Secretary-General on the basis of the relevant provisions of General Assembly resolutions 61/279 and 63/280, will contain mechanisms that are more flexible and that will make it possible to draw upon the capacity of the southern hemisphere.

The report of the Secretary-General reminds us of the importance of responsiveness, harmonization, flexibility and risk-tolerance in the financing mechanisms for the capacity of the system to give an appropriate response. The establishment of multi-donor trust funds and other pooled financing mechanisms for a country seems to us to be a measure that meets these requirements. However, we continue to be concerned about the trend of allocating earmarked funds to the detriment of regular funding, an imbalance which we believe to be the main cause of a lack of coherence in the United Nations system.

As regards the role of the Peacebuilding Commission, we have been interested to see the proposals of the Secretary-General with a view to continuing to improve its advisory function and its function as a forum for a discussion on aid effectiveness and for mutual accountability. The review envisaged for 2010 offers us an important opportunity to learn lessons from the experiences of these first few years and to take decisions on the improvements that need to be made.

We welcome the report's reference to the Economic and Social Council, although we regret the fact that it is limited to the issue of financing for development. That ignores one of the main functions of that organ, which is to coordinate the activities of the specialized agencies and making recommendations to them, especially in the context of the humanitarian segment and the operational activities segment.

Finally, allow me to touch on a matter closely related to today's discussion but not covered by the reflections of the Secretary-General, namely the desirability of initiating peacebuilding activities in countries that are still in conflict, taking into account the importance of effective coordination and mobilization of resources from the peacekeeping stage to the peacebuilding stage.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Brazil.

Ms. Dunlop (Brazil): I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for the opportunity to participate in this open debate on post-conflict peacebuilding. My delegation expresses its appreciation for this morning's briefing by Ambassador Heraldo Muñoz, Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission. We also thank the representative of the World Bank for his statement.

Brazil welcomes the report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304). It provides valuable insights on how to improve United Nations effectiveness in post-conflict situations. I would like, in particular, to comment on six aspects mentioned in the report.

First, we appreciate the strong emphasis the report places on country ownership. This principle should be the sine qua non for any strategy for peacebuilding. However, country ownership brings enormous challenges. Governments often lack the human and material resources needed to undertake the most elementary of tasks. But there are no shortcuts. We should spare no effort to strengthen local capacity so that the country concerned can tread its own path towards peace and development.

Secondly, the report correctly acknowledges the importance of regional actors in peacebuilding. Countries from the region usually share linguistic and cultural values and, very often, similar political and economic contexts. They are therefore very well placed to provide assistance. Also, the contribution from the global South should not be underestimated. South-South cooperation in post-conflict peacebuilding offers very promising avenues that have yet to be fully explored.

It is in the light of this perception that we should consider the Secretary-General's proposals for ensuring adequate and timely leadership on the ground. Standby civilian capacity mechanisms could benefit from the contribution of regional actors and developing countries. Their mandate should include, first and foremost, support to domestic institutions. Also, as the report indicates, they should not replace ongoing efforts to improve regular recruitment processes and human resources management.

Thirdly, the Secretary-General noticed that there are recurrent priorities to be taken into consideration in peacebuilding. They encompass a broad range of areas, from the restoration of key State functions to the promotion of economic recovery. Setting priorities

among priorities is indeed necessary. However, peacebuilding is a multidimensional enterprise. Priorities will necessarily contemplate different areas, especially in the fields of security and development, in which coordinated and simultaneous actions are indispensable. It is true that lack of security hampers economic development. But it is also true that peace cannot be sustainable in the midst of misery and despair.

Fourthly, we totally agree that funding is the backbone of peacebuilding. Any strategy, no matter how sophisticated or creative it might be, will have a short life in the absence of adequate financing. That is why we endorse the appeal by the Secretary-General for innovative and more flexible financing schemes, tailored to the specificities of peacebuilding. The Peacebuilding Fund has been extremely useful and will continue to be so under its new guidelines. But it was envisioned as a catalytic tool that needs complementary funding from other sources, on a reliable and continuous basis.

Fifthly, we praise the focus of the report on the immediate aftermath of conflict. Peace dividends should become visible to the population as soon as possible. Early recovery prevents the spiral of instability that could make the situation even more difficult and lead to the resumption of conflicts. Brazil believes the Peacebuilding Commission can also play an important role in countries in the immediate aftermath of conflict, should their Governments so request.

However, it should be borne in mind that many countries where conflict subsided years ago either suffer from donor fatigue or, worse still, have never been able to attain sustained international assistance. That is the case of Guinea-Bissau and the other countries currently on the agenda of the Peacebuilding Commission. The contribution of the Commission in these cases has been quite valuable, most notably with regard to the galvanization of international attention and the mobilization of resources.

We hope — and this is my sixth and final point — that the Secretary-General's recommendations to the Peacebuilding Commission can serve as a good basis for a comprehensive dialogue on how to enhance the Commission's work even further. Particular attention should be devoted to ways to streamline the Commission in the United Nations system and strengthen its coordination with United Nations bodies and other stakeholders, including regional organizations, the international financial institutions, civil society and the private sector. The 2010 review process will be a golden opportunity to address this and other issues.

The President: I give the floor next to the representative of Sierra Leone.

Mr. Davies (Sierra Leone): Mr. President, I had an opportunity to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency when I addressed this body during the recent meeting on the situation in Sierra Leone in respect of the Special Court for Sierra Leone. Let me once again, Mr. President, congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council and express the sincere gratitude of my delegation for inviting us to participate in this debate.

My delegation's appreciation also goes to the Secretary-General for his comprehensive report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict, jointly presented to the Security Council and the General Assembly (S/2009/304). I would also like to thank the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission and the representatives of the United Nations Development Programme and the World Bank for their valuable presentations this morning.

The Peacebuilding Commission was established to marshal the resources of the international community and to offer advice and propose strategies for post-conflict recovery, with a special focus on reconstruction, institution-building and sustainable development in countries emerging from conflict.

In order to accomplish these goals, the Committee set itself the following objectives: first, to propose integrated strategies for post-conflict peacebuilding and recovery; second, help to ensure predictable financing for early recovery activities and sustained financial investment over the medium to longer term; third, extend the period of attention by the international community to post-conflict recovery; and fourth, to develop best practices on issues that require extensive collaboration among political, military, humanitarian and development actors. Therefore, any consideration of a report presented concurrently to the Security Council and the General Assembly should be gauged by the above parameters, with regard to the attainment of the priorities of the countries on the agenda of the Peacebuilding Commission.

Four years have gone by, and the proposed integrated strategies for post-conflict peacebuilding and recovery and the development of best practices on issues that require extensive collaboration among political, military, humanitarian and development actors have evolved substantially, as spelled out in the report before us. The countries on the Commission's agenda continue to receive the international community's attention. It is very crucial to advance these objectives to the next level and to help to ensure predictable financing for early recovery activities and sustained financial investment over the medium to longer term.

Peacebuilding is a powerful conflict-prevention mechanism both in societies that have experienced violent conflict and in those on the verge of sliding into conflict. However, studies reveal that the United Nations and the international community have tended to invest more resources on conflict resolution and peacemaking than on the preventive aspect.

The consolidation of peace in societies emerging from conflict depends entirely on the efforts and initiatives undertaken to address the immediate aftermath of conflict — a phase characterized by the complete withdrawal of the remnants of arms from communities, the reassimilation of internally displaced persons, refugees and ex-combatants into civil society and the provision of relief. These, in our opinion, rank among the key components required for stabilizing post-conflict situations in order to pave the way for various reform initiatives and long-term recovery programmes.

We must bear in mind that if these factors remain unaddressed, the potential for societies to slide back into conflict can be imminent. It is also worth noting that studies have shown that societies emerging from violent conflict are more likely to relapse into hostilities in the first five to ten years following the end of conflict. Thus a rapid and effective engagement of the above-mentioned components can be crucial for the future stability, recovery and the sustainable development of those societies.

On the home front, Sierra Leone has come a long way. Since the end of the war, we have had three general elections, the last of which brought the opposition party, the All People's Congress of President Ernest Bai Koroma, to power. We recently had the quarterly review of the implementation of the mandate of the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone. Leadership of actors on the ground is well coordinated. The numerous strategic frameworks have been completely streamlined in President Ernest Bai Koroma's Agenda for Change. The recently concluded second generation of the poverty-reduction strategy and the Joint Vision of the United Nations country team as a coordination mechanism for partnership collaboration with the Government have been realized.

The recent hiccup in mid-March that tested our resolve for peaceful coexistence as a nation was swiftly addressed by the Government and the Executive Representative of the Secretary-General by encouraging the leaderships of two main political parties to take responsibility for the actions of their supporters. That effort brought the inter-party dialogue back on track and, since then, the situation has normalized.

The high-level event, hosted at the request of the Chair of the Sierra Leone country-specific meeting, the Permanent Representative of Canada, Ambassador John McKee, and the Government of Sierra Leone on 10 June this year, sought to move forward the Sierra Leone peacebuilding agenda by marshalling support for the Government's Agenda for Change and the second phase of the poverty-reduction strategy by announcing the establishment of a $350 million donor trust fund for the implementation of those strategic frameworks. The Government appeals for, and looks forward to, a favourable response now and at the forthcoming Consultative Group meeting, to be held in London in November.

On behalf of the Government of Sierra Leone, I would like to register our sincere appreciation for the continued engagement of the United Nations, our bilateral partners and the international community on Sierra Leone and for the determination to consolidate peace and democracy and to put Sierra Leone on the path to sustainable development.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Uruguay.

Mr. Álvarez (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): At the outset, allow me to congratulate the Council for having convened this debate on such an important topic. Peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict is crucial in guaranteeing peace, security and the minimal conditions for human development for

millions of people who have emerged or who are emerging from conflict, as well as in preventing such conflicts from reoccurring.

In that respect, Uruguay would like to take this opportunity to highlight certain aspects of the report (S/2009/304) presented this morning by the Secretary-General that we find to be particularly relevant.

Probably the most striking point in that report relates to the need to give greater coordination and coherence within and beyond the United Nations system to peacebuilding efforts. That point, summarized in the need to approach this issue from a comprehensive standpoint that encompasses the various key areas to stabilize a country and to begin to give it concrete steps in its economic and social development, is crucial for the international community's peacebuilding efforts to be effective and sustainable.

In that regard, we are convinced that the Peacebuilding Commission is a key tool to improving the current situation, and we hope that the 2010 review process creates a favourable climate for that body to fully engage in the area of coordination.

In that respect, let me stress that the Peacebuilding Commission is unique in being probably the only intergovernmental forum that brings together developing and developed countries to jointly discuss peacebuilding and reconstruction; that links political aspects, such as those of security and development; that so closely involves itself in specific countries; and that has a level of legitimacy that probably no other body has.

Meanwhile, we fully agree with a number of concepts highlighted in the report, such as the need to strengthen national ownership and to give priority to a country's own needs, which goes hand in hand with strengthening national capacity from the start.

Likewise, we appreciate that issues linked to security, undoubtedly indispensable to providing a minimum framework of stability, be only one area in which the Secretariat has proposed seeking considerable progress in the coming months. Support for governmental institutions that serve essential functions, the reintegration of returnees, early employment generation, the rehabilitation of basic infrastructure and various aspects of economic revitalization are activities of equal priority, without which peacebuilding is not sustainable.

As we have already stated in other thematic debates, it also seems important that dialogue and peace processes be inclusive and representative, and we agree that regional organizations can play a positive role in that respect.

From the standpoint of a developing country that has actively cooperated in peacekeeping as well as in early recovery activities, primarily through valuable human resources, we particularly appreciate the emphasis placed on the need for the United Nations to draw more on/take better advantage of the capacities in the southern hemisphere in order to contribute to the task of peacebuilding. In that regard, we hope to see the realization of the idea put forward by the Secretary-General in the report of creating new systems of outreach to appropriately qualified personnel from developing countries. Uruguay, along with the rest of our region, has valuable human resources to contribute in various areas key to peacebuilding.

Somewhat linked to the aspect mentioned earlier, there is one matter that caught our attention it was not covered properly in the report of the Secretary-General. It concerns the support that military personnel deployed in peacekeeping operations could contribute, precisely in that early period, when there is a transition towards a peacebuilding phase or when both tasks — peacekeeping and peacebuilding — occur simultaneously.

The role of peacekeepers as early peacebuilders must not be underestimated. The support that such personnel can contribute in key areas such as providing security and strengthening the rule of law, including areas such as disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, as well as security sector reform and even expanding State authority, must be drawn on. The positive effect of quick-impact projects should also be taken into account. There are over 100,000 women and men deployed in 16 missions who can provide a resolute contribution in the early stages of restoring stability.

To conclude, as is clear from the report and this debate, much remains to be done with respect to mechanisms of the management, financing and coordination of peacebuilding. That is only natural, bearing in mind that this Organization has undertaken systematic and institutionalized efforts in this area for

only a short time. For that reason, Uruguay believes that it is extremely timely for all of us to take this opportunity to renew our support to the Peacebuilding Commission and take advantage of the approaching 2010 review to strengthen it and make it an even more effective tool for the Organization.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Norway.

Mr. Brevik (Norway): Norway welcomes the report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304). We fully agree with the report's emphasis on national ownership and on the need to meet countries' demand for strengthening of national and local capacities.

The role of the United Nations should be to coordinate international efforts. To fulfil this role, the United Nations country team must be able to draw on staff quickly and assign them to appropriate positions without having to engage in time-consuming administrative rules and regulations. Norway therefore supports the recommendation of the Secretary-General to Member States to approve reform packages on human resources.

We also welcome the initiative of the Secretary-General to create a senior-level mechanism at United Nations Headquarters to ensure that the right leadership and support teams are in place as early as possible.

Despite the comprehensiveness of the report, Norway would have liked to see the roles of the various sectors described more fully in the report. We believe that undefined responsibility leads to a lack of accountability. We trust that the work in this area will continue in the time ahead.

Although significant progress has been made in comprehensive strategic planning, there remain serious challenges in trying to coordinate security, political, humanitarian and development efforts in post-conflict situations. The report addresses this fundamental dilemma by stating that the senior United Nations leadership team has the responsibility to ensure strategic coordination and linkages between the relevant frameworks. All parts of the United Nations system need to improve dialogue and coordination and should be provided with incentives to avoid duplication, inefficiency and delays in the commencement of operations. Member States need to take a lead role in requesting and supporting these improvements.

In that regard, Norway commends the steps taken to improve the working relationship between the United Nations and the World Bank with the Partnership Framework Agreement. This is of vital importance and will hopefully improve both the strategic coordination and the collective impact of the United Nations and the World Bank's efforts on the ground.

The Peacebuilding Commission should play a more central role in ensuring that the international community is a more reliable partner to Governments of post-conflict countries. The role of the Peacebuilding Commission in promoting greater coherence and synergies between the different parts of the United Nations system and other partners should be strengthened. It is essential that adequate resources be made available to the Peacebuilding Support Office in order to support the Peacebuilding Commission and administer the Peacebuilding Fund in an efficient manner.

As stated in the report, the Peacebuilding Fund should strengthen its focus on core peacebuilding activities. Thus far, the Peacebuilding Fund has largely supported later-stage peacebuilding activities rather than providing a rapid, flexible and risk-tolerant approach directed at the immediate aftermath of conflict.

The report of the Secretary-General sets out an agenda to strengthen the United Nations response in the immediate aftermath of conflict and the facilitation of an earlier, more coherent response from the wider international community. Successful implementation of the agenda requires political will, prioritization and the alignment of funding from Member States. Let me reiterate Norway's commitment to the reinforcement of the existing peacebuilding mechanisms and our support for the recommendations stated in the report.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of India.

Mr. Singh Puri (India): At the outset, let me thank you, Sir, for scheduling today's debate. We are addressing a topic that we believe is very relevant to the raison d'être of the United Nations. I also welcome the report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in

the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304), which underpins today's discussion.

The report collates several significant findings and recommendations. Key among these is the need for a more coherent and effective international engagement during the brief window between the cessation of conflict and the establishment of a peace process, and the more complex process of ensuring that such processes remain on track. There are clearly two levels of intervention in support of a peace process. The first is at the national and local level, and the second is at the regional and international level. Both processes must move in lockstep.

However, that said, there are several elements of detail that require attention. These include the need to ensure that the supporting external interventions focus on delivering a peace dividend, expanding national capacity and ensuring the expansion of basic economic capacity so that surplus labour — especially young people — can be gainfully employed.

Such efforts need to be based on recognition of the complexity of post-conflict scenarios. Not all peace processes and agreements address the underlying causes of conflict. Similarly, not all local actors are untarnished by the rigours of conflict. Yet we need to work pragmatically with the actors and circumstances as we find them, not as we would wish them to be. From that standpoint, it is important to ensure that priority-setting be a local endeavour. It is both politically unworkable and strategically perilous for the international community to involve itself in determining national priorities. Sustainable peace requires genuine national ownership of the process, not a process that is nationally owned only in times of difficulty.

It is therefore essential that from the outset peace consolidation efforts be focused upon expanding the capacity and competence of the local Government to deliver services. Without this, there can be no national ownership or development, and without either there will be no sustainable peace. There is a particular contribution that the nations of the South can make in this context, both with regard to providing training and services and with regard to providing appropriate technologies. These potentialities need to be explored further.

At the same time, there is also a need for greater efforts to align national and international efforts in multilateral forums. Through better alignment and coordination, we can conceivably achieve more coherent interventions and inputs on the ground. This requires better horizontal and vertical coherence. That is to say, we need more coherent efforts by the international community to integrate sometimes disparate efforts in dealing with cross-cutting themes in a peacebuilding context. Too often, the well-meaning efforts of the international community tend to be at cross purposes, thereby undermining the collective effort.

Similarly, vertical coordination is also required, in particular within the United Nations and its agencies and programmes, to ensure that a common objective is matched by a clear road map to that objective. Coordination and consultation between the United Nations and the international financial institutions, especially the World Bank, must also be expanded.

The report clearly recognizes that if the United Nations is to be a lead actor in the process of peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict, more must be done to improve its efficiency. It is of course positive that the report recognizes such lacunae. It is also important that the report implicitly recognizes that of itself; the significant convening power that the United Nations brings to the table is not enough. Thus, section V of the report dwells at length on the means by which the United Nations and its funds and programmes may be able to contribute more effectively to the process. Naturally, as practitioners on the ground will be better able to assess the potential efficacy of such measures, perhaps in time more deep-rooted reform will be required.

I would like to conclude by highlighting the need for further consideration and discussion of the complex issue of post-conflict peacebuilding. We need to be able to frame this debate within a conceptual framework that tries to answer certain larger questions regarding the purposes and principles of international involvement in post-conflict peace consolidation. These include the question of where early recovery fits within the larger continuum of peacekeeping and peacebuilding, and where the transition from peacekeeping to peacebuilding, and from peacebuilding to peace consolidation and development, begins.

We also need to ask ourselves how international investment, both in money and political will, can be

expanded in support of peacebuilding. In that context, there is clearly a need to expand the role of the Peacebuilding Commission and to deepen its strategic relationship with the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Social and Economic Council.

I look forward to a continuing dialogue on this subject in this and other forums within the United Nations.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Thailand.

Mrs. Chaimongkol (Thailand): On behalf of the Government and the people of Thailand, I wish to warmly congratulate the delegation of Uganda upon its assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of July. I would like also, Sir, to express our sincere appreciation for your leadership in convening this timely Security Council debate on the very important issue of post-conflict peacebuilding.

Like other delegations that took the floor earlier, the Government of Thailand shares the commitment of the international community to this critical issue and stands ready to work with partners to advance the agenda for the benefit of people on the ground. In this connection, my delegation would like to take this opportunity to share our views on the issue with the Council.

First, Thailand welcomes the report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304) and would like to thank the Peacebuilding Support Office for its commendable work. We agree with the emphasis of the report on early action and national ownership in the peacebuilding process. The report highlights critical gaps in peacebuilding efforts and provides useful recommendations on ways and means to strengthen the United Nations response as well as international cooperation on this matter.

Secondly, Thailand supports the strengthening of United Nations leadership and coordination on peacebuilding. As the largest intergovernmental organization, with specialized agencies spanning a comprehensive set of issues and a close partnership with a variety of civil society organizations on the ground, the United Nations is, we believe, in a unique position to bring all relevant actors on board to ensure more effective coordination and a more coherent response at both the policy level and on the ground in support of the priorities and strategies of all countries concerned. With a common vision and a coherent coordination mechanism among the United Nations agencies, donors and other relevant actors, country-specific needs and priorities would have a better chance of being fulfilled and limited resources would be better utilized.

Thirdly, Thailand is of the view that security and economic challenges must be addressed simultaneously and given equal weight when priorities for peacebuilding are being determined. Security and development are interconnected and cannot be tackled in isolation. It is important to keep in mind that there is no one-size-fits-all solution or formula for rebuilding a society that has undergone conflict. Every situation is unique and the particular dynamics of each case, as well as the competing demands and interests of all parties concerned in a given society, should be taken fully into account when setting a country's priorities and strategies. In other words, the process must be bottom-up to be durable.

Fourthly, to promote national ownership and sustainable peace in the long run, Thailand believes that local expertise and resources should be fully mobilized, while the country's resources management capability should also be strengthened. When international experts are called on to deliver advice and services on the ground, geographical balance and representation should be taken into consideration. And at the start of a peacebuilding process, the relevant actors should have an end goal in sight. It is important to stress that peacebuilding is not a perpetual process, but a supportive beginning to sustainable peace and development.

Fifthly, Thailand believes that regional actors can significantly influence the peace process and that engagement with such key players in peacebuilding efforts is indispensable. Therefore, we encourage closer and more systematic consultations, as well as sharing of experience, between the United Nations and relevant regional partners throughout the peacebuilding process, from the very outset.

We also recognize the potentially positive contribution of South-South cooperation and trilateral partnerships in assisting countries emerging from conflict, bearing in mind the comparative advantage of the sharing of experience between developing countries

or those with similar social, cultural or political structures, with the support of the donor community.

Sixthly, Thailand strongly supports the Secretary-General's recommendation that the Security Council should proactively consider how to more actively utilize the advice of the Peacebuilding Commission in its consideration of post-conflict situations. We also support the Secretary-General in his view that, for countries on the Security Council's agenda, the respective roles of the Council and the Commission need to be seen as complementary and parallel, rather than sequenced in a manner that could diminish the Commission's role during earlier phases where it could add significant value.

In conclusion, I wish to reiterate Thailand's firm commitment to peacebuilding and our strong support for a holistic approach to the issue of peace and security. We believe that in the present age of globalization and increasing interdependence, it is imperative to address conflicts comprehensively — both upstream and downstream. Conflict prevention, peacekeeping and peacebuilding should always be looked at in their totality. We are committed to supporting the work of the United Nations in this regard. We look forward to constructive consultations leading to the review of the arrangements of the Peacebuilding Commission in 2010, with the goal of strengthening its contribution to the effects of peacebuilding.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Pakistan.

Mr. Haroon (Pakistan): Let me congratulate you, Mr. President, on Uganda's assumption of the stewardship of the Security Council for this month. We appreciate the opportunity to participate in this discussion of the report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304).

We thank the Secretary-General for his report, which contains an objective analysis of the challenges and opportunities of post-conflict peacebuilding. While the challenges addressed in the report may not be new, the value-added of this report is the fresh perspective and impetus it could provide on the ways and means of addressing these challenges in a more timely and effective manner. Drawing on past experiences, a closer review of ground realities and expectations and an extensive process of consultations, the report outlines an agenda that can guide and better inform our collective action in forging more coherent, efficient and predictable responses to the peacebuilding needs of countries emerging from conflict.

While the report's focus is on the initial two-year post-conflict period, it is good to note that it addresses a wide range of policy issues and practical tools in a manner that retains the broader and long-term perspective of peacebuilding. But since there is a proven risk of relapse into conflict within the first five years, it is important for the international community to devote particular attention to doing things right in the immediate aftermath of conflict.

It is true that the challenges are immense in that period, but so are the hopes and aspirations of the people affected by conflict, who are determined to seize the opportunity of peace and to turn a new page for a better and more secure and prosperous future. That is what must happen. It is those people who have the greatest interest and highest stakes in peacebuilding. It is therefore only logical that they have full leadership and ownership over the process.

However, since countries emerging from conflict face complex and fragile situations, and most often lack the capacities and resources to overcome the challenges on their own, it is incumbent upon the international community to help them to lay foundations for sustainable peace and development. That partnership is at the heart of successful peacebuilding. It comes as no surprise that the report of the Secretary-General is structured around those central pillars of national ownership, with the good governance and honest and sincere purpose that are essential. That must also include international partnership, with sufficient resources and the will to understand, not dominate.

Today, peacebuilding is an established component of the comprehensive approach to conflict prevention and resolution. It is a direct manifestation of the interlinkage between peace and development. The general principles of effective peacebuilding are well recognized. As the Secretary-General has observed, it entails a common strategic vision based on clearly defined and agreed national priorities, and coherent and concerted action backed by the required capacity and resources aligned with that strategy.

We believe that, in order to succeed, that endeavour must be people-centric, responsible to the

specific needs and circumstances and designed to reinforce their confidence in and support for the peace process. The central objectives of establishing security, promoting inclusive political processes and reconciliation, delivering early tangible peace dividends and building national capacities for governance, economic recovery and development should all be sensitive to that human dimension of peacebuilding.

While there is a fair degree of convergence on the principles and objectives of peacebuilding, the main challenge is to translate it fully into practice. The true test of the Secretary-General's report will be in the implementation of his recommendations. That requires, above all, the political will and commitment, not only of national actors but also of international partners, to stand behind and implement a common strategy, not one that is divergent. While the latter need to demonstrate more understanding and flexibility to align their support with national priorities and to eliminate conditionalities, the former, on their part, also need to inculcate the required responsibility and values of governance that correspond to ownership and infuse confidence among all partners.

The Secretary-General is right in saying — and this is very important — that investment in national capacity-building should be part of the entry, rather than — in that well-known and oft-used phrase — the exit strategy. Priority should be on identifying, tapping and harnessing the civilian capacities available nationally before resorting to regional or international expertise, as required. I would now like to remind my colleagues of what Mr. Brahimi said in this very Council on 20 May 2008.

> "We should have as many international staff as we need to get the job done, but not one single staff member more than that. Our goal in the mission, individually and collectively, should be from the outset to work ourselves out of a job." (*S/PV.5895, p. 10*)

The most ominous gap, however, is in funding and resources. The various recommendations contained in the report aimed at generating rapid, flexible and predictable funding would require cooperation and support from Member States, in particular from donors, as well as enhanced collaboration with the international financial institutions, which have not been so forthcoming to this institution in the past and which would need to show more operational flexibility in the assistance programmes for countries emerging from conflict, considering their plight and special circumstances.

From the point of view of enhancing national ownership and capacity, it should also be very important that most of the funding also be provided through governmental channels. But it would make a lot of sense to devote attention, from the very outset, to mobilizing international resources, especially through better management and the exploitation of natural resources, for the benefit of a country and its people.

Peacebuilding is a complex undertaking involving parallel and coordinated efforts on the security, political, humanitarian and development fronts. The United Nations, with its wide-ranging mechanisms, capacity and expertise, is well-placed to coordinate and lead international action in this field — of course, with the support of other partners, particularly the World Bank.

We welcome the commitment of the Secretary-General to improve the peacebuilding efforts of the United Nations. The Peacebuilding Commission, with its unique composition and specific mandate, has a pivotal role in those efforts. Strengthening the Commission and utilizing its full potential is therefore essential in advancing the peacebuilding objectives of the United Nations. For effective responses in the immediate aftermath of conflict, it would make more sense if the Peacebuilding Commission were engaged from the very outset of the involvement of the United Nations, particularly where integrated peacekeeping missions are deployed. The Commission also has a critical role to play in the follow-up to the Secretary-General's report. Full implementation of the report would also entail the engagement and contribution of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council.

In conclusion, I would like to say that the success of peacebuilding efforts will be gauged eventually by the tangible benefits and results on the ground, not merely by the organizational skill that we have to show here. We hope that this debate, which to us is part of the process that began in the Peacebuilding Commission last week, will contribute to that same objective, which is at the very heart of the Secretary-General's excellent report.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Bangladesh.

Ms. Jahan (Bangladesh): May I also join preceding speakers in thanking you, Mr. President, for convening this important debate on post-conflict peacebuilding, an issue that deserves greater international attention, particularly in the context of the complex and varied challenges faced by countries emerging from conflict.

In the same vein, my delegation would like to commend the report (S/2009/304) of the Secretary-General before us on the issue of peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict. Our appreciation also goes out to the Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission and the representatives of the United Nations Development Programme and the World Bank for the important presentations they made earlier today.

We would like to emphasize that the Peacebuilding Commission should have the central role in post-conflict peacebuilding. The Commission, in institutional harmony with the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office, should act as the primary body responsible for the coordination of coherent and integrated peacebuilding activities, as envisaged by the foundational resolutions 60/180 of the General Assembly and 1645 (2005) of the Security Council.

At the same time, we would like to underline the importance of a more cohesive relationship among the Peacebuilding Commission, the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. In the context of the 2010 review of the mandate of the Peacebuilding Commission, we look forward to working closely with all concerned on how to enhance and strengthen that mandate to make it more effective.

My delegation fully supports the emphasis placed in the Secretary-General's report on the principle that post-conflict societies must take charge of their own destiny. With a view to the achievement of that goal, we call upon international partners to align their financial, technical and political support around a commonly agreed national strategy that essentially takes into account national ownership and priorities. We also emphasize the need for all post-conflict strategies and interventions to address the needs of women; young people, particularly ex-combatants; and children, including child soldiers, as the case may be.

We strongly emphasize the need for national capacity-building from the very outset in order to establish sustainable peace so that countries are prevented from relapsing into conflict. In that regard, existing national capacities must be taken into account.

Bangladesh also encourages the involvement of civil society and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in development activities at the local level. We believe that that could, in effect, significantly contribute to the process of achieving sustainable economic growth, leading to sustainable peace and development in countries emerging from conflict.

In that context, I should like to mention that a leading NGO of Bangladesh, with wide-ranging operations and interventions in terms of health, education, agriculture and microfinance development projects, has recently begun to work in the reconstruction processes of post-conflict countries such as the southern Sudan, Liberia and Sierra Leone. The same organization has been making invaluable contributions to the reconstruction of Afghanistan since 2002, amid formidable challenges. That could be considered an ideal example of a successful South-South cooperation and development initiative.

The Secretary-General's recommendation concerning rapidly deployable and skilled civilian capacity deserves detailed examination. Any initiative towards building such capacity should be thoroughly discussed in more inclusive forums, such as the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations and the Peacebuilding Commission.

We reaffirm the importance of a more rapid and flexible funding mechanism, as well as predictable funds. These are of the utmost importance to supporting national and local authorities in delivering a peace dividend at an early stage.

We welcome the Secretary-General's initiatives to streamline coordination among Headquarters, special representatives of the Secretary-General, United Nations country teams, national Governments and the Peacebuilding Commission. While we recognize the need for an extended role for United Nations leadership on the ground in the immediate aftermath of conflict, we would like to emphasize that such efforts should not undermine national ownership of the peacebuilding process. Rather, efforts must be taken to facilitate, promote and complement the country specific capacity building mechanism and ownership of the process.

In that regard, given the evolving scenario of the peacebuilding process, we would stress the need for the further harmonization and consolidation of United Nations-led initiatives, regarding which lessons learned from the Security Council-mandated integrated peacekeeping missions could be taken into account.

Finally, we strongly emphasize the need for greater synergy between peacekeeping operations and peacebuilding activities, as many of the important elements of peacebuilding process — such as disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, security sector reform and the rule of law — emanate directly from Council-mandated peacekeeping operations.

We believe that, if peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of a conflict is to succeed, focus should be on identifying context-sensitive approaches that will provide for sustainable national political dialogue aimed at reconciliation among the parties to the conflict, with the participation of all stakeholders. The involvement of all stakeholders in identifying key national priorities is essential, and the involvement of women in that process is a key element. Unity of vision should be maintained when designing a clear and coordinated mandate to define the leadership role of the United Nations agencies on the ground. Adequate attention should be provided at an early stage to avoid duplication of efforts and ensure the efficient use of scarce resources.

The President: I now call on the representative of Italy.

Mr. Terzi di Sant'Agata (Italy): Allow me first to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation to the Ugandan presidency of the Security Council for taking the initiative of convening this crucial debate on peacebuilding and for the invitation to take the floor. I would like to thank the Secretary-General for his timely report (S/2009/304) and his remarks. I would also like to thank Ambassador Heraldo Muñoz, Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission; Mr. Jordan Ryan, Assistant Administrator and Director of the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery at the United Nations Development Programme; and Mr. Alastair McKechnie, Director of the Fragile and Conflict-Affected Countries Group at the World Bank, for their important briefings.

I would like to align myself with the statement delivered by the Swedish Presidency of the European Union.

As underlined by the Secretary-General, the post-conflict phase offers a window of opportunity that can be essential in supporting countries previously involved in conflict in developing a path towards normalcy. However, in the phase of developing such a path, the situation often remains fluid and the peace fragile. Getting the timing and sequencing right among priorities requires a delicate balance, as the Secretary-General puts it. A coordinated approach is therefore needed, as are the definition of clear priorities and flexible tools and the availability of quickly deployable human and financial resources.

In that light, the revision of the terms of reference of the Peacebuilding Fund is very welcome. The international community as a whole should collaborate in that process at the multilateral and bilateral levels. Peacebuilding should be conceived as a single process in which everyone can participate and contribute in an integrated manner. That is the spirit in which the 2005 World Summit decided to establish the Peacebuilding Commission.

Italy welcomes the Secretary-General's report, since it represents a true road map for activities to be performed in the aftermath of a conflict — a real policy document for all the actors involved. The principle of national ownership is central. The peacebuilding intervention should be anchored at the country level — again, as stated by the Secretary-General — with the engagement of all the actors involved. That means an inclusive process sensitive to the requests of civil society.

The fundamental role of regional and subregional organizations — in particular, the African Union — must also be emphasized, as must the need to develop forms of collaboration within the United Nations. There is a need to improve the effectiveness and coherence of the United Nations system's response, along with the concept of accountable United Nations leadership on the ground.

An effective peacebuilding effort requires the capability on the ground to deploy civilian experts as well. We are encouraged by the positive assessment of the Standing Police Capacity, which constitutes a useful reference for building a rule-of-law standing capacity. Quite rightly, another review has been proposed on how the United Nations can help to broaden and deepen the pool of civilian experts.

The Peacebuilding Commission was created in 2005 to fill the gap between peacekeeping and post-conflict rehabilitation. It plays a central role by bringing coherence to the recovery of countries emerging from conflict. That is why it was decided that the Peacebuilding Commission should be an advisory body not only for the General Assembly, but also for the Security Council.

An interesting suggestion has been made by the Secretary-General that the Security Council consider more proactively the advice of the Peacebuilding Commission. We subscribe to this suggestion. It is an important point which aims at enhancing the consultative role of the Commission vis-à-vis the whole United Nations system and as the principal organ responsible for the definition of mandates and for conflict management.

Our approach to peacebuilding seeks to foster political and democratic stabilization while stimulating economic growth. In this framework, Italy's assistance in the energy sector in Sierra Leone is one example of the possibilities that we have at our disposal. Another example involves the fight against drugs and crime, an endeavour that is critical to peacebuilding. During its tenure in the Security Council, my country actively promoted the inclusion of these aspects in the mandates of the United Nations Offices in Sierra Leone and Guinea-Bissau, and contributed to a number of security sector reform and rule of law initiatives led by the Economic Community of West African States, the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in Guinea-Bissau.

My country intends to strengthen its technical support for the work of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) in West Africa. A task force of selected police officers of the Guardia di Finanza, Italy's customs police, will be deployed in Dakar within the framework of UNODC's law enforcement capacity-building programme in the fight against illicit drug trafficking.

As the country chairing the G-8 this year, Italy has been actively engaged in fulfilling the commitment taken by the G-8 at Sea Island and Hokkaido. In the G-8 leaders' declaration, emphasis was placed on the need for a comprehensive approach to peacekeeping and peacebuilding. During the G-8 meeting in Trieste, prior to its meeting in L'Aquila, the G-8 foreign ministers welcomed the Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict — the report we are discussing today — and encouraged all relevant actors to consider its recommendations.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Republic of Korea.

Mr. Park In-kook (Republic of Korea): I thank you, Mr. President, for organizing today's meeting. I also appreciate the Secretary-General's insightful and comprehensive report (S/2009/304) and his briefing on the five key points this morning.

The immediate aftermath of conflict presents a unique set of challenges and opportunities. That period is a most delicate and fragile time. Early action taken at that stage is critical because it will shape and determine the overall future of the peace process. It may not be an exaggeration to say that the window of opportunity for establishing sustainable peace depends mostly on how the immediate aftermath of the conflict is managed. My delegation welcomes the Secretary-General's report as an answer to this challenge and fully endorses the recommendations contained in the report. Looking forward to rapid and full implementation of those recommendations, I would like to highlight the following points.

First, our efforts in early recovery stages should be focused on having a quick impact on the ground. Immediately after the conflict, immense demands tend to arise in virtually every sector of the political, social and economic arenas, while the national capacity to accommodate these demands, virtually destroyed during the conflict, has yet to be restored. Thus, our efforts at this stage should be focused on meeting those most urgent and immediate demands and responding to peacebuilding priorities.

Among other tools, quick-impact projects have proven to be instrumental in this area. The United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire is one of the United Nations missions that are actively employing this tool with successful results. My delegation hopes that quick-impact projects will be more fully integrated into our peacebuilding strategies at their early stages.

Secondly, integrated leadership and expertise from the United Nations needs to be present on the ground at the earliest possible stage. In this vein, my delegation welcomes the recommendations of the

Secretary-General to establish senior-level leadership mechanisms and support teams that would be present on the ground at the earliest critical juncture. I also appreciate the recommendation to broaden the rapidly deployable civilian expert groups.

While peacebuilding efforts should be country-specific, in many cases involving post-conflict countries certain priorities are observed recurring at the early stages. With the experience and lessons learned so far, my delegation believes that we will be able to develop ready-made toolkits to address those recurring priorities.

Thirdly, the role and capacity of non-State actors and civil society need to be recognized and integrated into the peacebuilding process. As the report points out, we look forward to United Nations Volunteers playing a catalytic role in mobilizing civil capacity to re-establish the fabric of society. In addition, the role and participation of women in the process should be particularly ensured, as many of my colleagues have emphasized during today's debate.

Fourthly, while the strategic partnerships of the United Nations with the World Bank and other international financial institutions are imperative, more coherent partnerships with development agencies, most notably the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), should be reinforced. The early engagement of these agencies will ensure a smoother transition from early post-conflict stages to peacebuilding and ultimately to longer-term sustainable economic development. The expertise of UNDP in assisting national capacity will also be instrumental in early national capacity restoration. Additionally, how we can secure the synergy effect between the integrated peacebuilding offices and United Nations country teams is another area that deserves our close attention.

Fifthly, as Ambassador Muñoz properly pointed out this morning, we recommend that the Security Council consider the advice of the Peacebuilding Commission in a more proactive manner. There has been an increasing number of observations that peacekeepers are early peacebuilders. Moreover, the mandates of the current peacekeeping missions clearly overlap with peacebuilding activities, as is illustrated in the case of the United Nation Stabilization Mission in Haiti. Considering this fact, our discussion on peacekeeping missions should closely incorporate the peacebuilding aspect, especially in the early stages.

Finally, I would like to emphasize that national ownership is an indispensable principle in the peacebuilding process. National authorities should take the primary responsibility for rapidly re-establishing national institutions, restoring the rule of law and revitalizing economies. National ownership should also be respected in the consideration of the peacebuilding process in cases where advice is requested. When a post-conflict country requests to be advised by the Peacebuilding Commission, its request should be considered in a most prompt manner, focusing on the interests of the people on the ground.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Switzerland.

Mrs. Grau (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): I thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this debate. Allow me to focus on three aspects of the report (S/2009/304) that we are discussing today.

First, we welcome the exemplary consultation process for this report. That way of proceeding well illustrates the potential role of the Peacebuilding Support Office as a catalyst. To be effective, the Office should play that role in conjunction with strong leadership of the Secretary-General. The Security Council has an important role to play in supporting that combination by recognizing the functions of the two actors and by supporting them. In mission management in particular, we invite the Council to increase its consultation of the Peacebuilding Commission, whose potential asset is its ability to mobilize the skills of a wide range of actors.

We support the proposal that the Chairs of the country-specific meetings of the Peacebuilding Commission be invited to participate in the work of the subsidiary bodies of the Security Council concerning the countries in question. Before us, we have specific examples of the challenges of coherence, in the reports on mediation and on peacebuilding and in the New Horizon non-paper on peacekeeping. To head up those efforts concerning the crucial and complementary aspects of the United Nations system, we would like to see a note by the Secretary-General that highlights their complementarity and gives us an overview of the various available financial instruments. Only if the complementarity of instruments and the transparency of financial flows are considerably improved will there be more effective, flexible and predictable funding for peacebuilding.

Secondly, the report stresses the need to develop national and regional capacities and the skills of the senior managers and of the teams deployed on the ground. We welcome those recommendations, and my country is willing to share the experience acquired through our own pools of national experts.

The credibility and the effectiveness of the United Nations depend above all on the skills of its permanent staff and on a cross-cutting awareness of conflict issues within the various institutions of the United Nations system. Peacebuilding is not the exclusive preserve of any one body, but is the responsibility of all actors under the active leadership of the Secretary-General.

Thirdly, the United Nations and the World Bank, as well as our capitals, must provide the personnel in the field with the best possible support by establishing a more effective, coherent and coordinated support system. The report shows us that there are already a number of instruments that favour a joint approach, such as, for example, the Post-Conflict Needs Assessment or integrated task forces. We must ensure the effective use of those instruments and not multiply the reporting and the number of planning and monitoring instruments. That effort must be made jointly with the development banks, regional organizations and the donor community.

We are convinced of the importance of qualified leadership in the countries concerned, supported by an able team. In that regard, we would like the funds, programmes and specialized agencies to recognize strengthened authority of the Resident Coordinator vis-à-vis the United Nations country team, particularly when the Coordinator holds the post of Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General. We propose that the Chief Executives Board make a decision in that regard.

I would like to conclude by emphasizing the importance of measuring all improvements in processes and institutions by their positive impact in the field.

The President: After consultations among members of the Security Council, I have been authorized to make following statement on behalf of the Council:

"The Security Council recalls the statement of its President (S/PRST/2008/16) and emphasizes the critical importance of post-conflict peacebuilding as the foundation for building sustainable peace and development in the aftermath of conflict.

"The Security Council welcomes the report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304) as an important contribution towards a more effective and coherent international response to post-conflict peacebuilding. The Council also welcomes the Secretary-General's strong commitment expressed in the report to improve the United Nations peacebuilding efforts, and urges him to pursue these objectives.

"The Security Council emphasizes the importance of national ownership and the need for national authorities to take responsibility as soon as possible for re-establishing the institutions of Government, restoring the rule of law, revitalizing the economy, reforming the security sector, providing basic services and other key peacebuilding needs. The Council underscores the vital role of the United Nations in supporting national authorities to develop an early strategy, in close consultation with international partners, to address these priorities, and encourages international partners to align their financial, technical and political support behind this strategy.

"The Security Council stresses the need, in countries emerging from conflict, to draw upon and develop existing national capacities at the earliest possible stage, and the importance of rapidly deployable civilian expertise to help achieve this, including, where appropriate, relevant expertise from the region. The Council, in this regard, welcomes the recommendation of the Secretary-General for a review to be undertaken to analyse how the United Nations and international community can help to broaden and deepen the pool of civilian experts, giving particular attention to mobilizing capacities from developing countries and especially women.

"The Security Council recognizes that post-conflict situations require from the outset experienced and skilled leadership on the ground with effective support teams, and requests the United Nations to increase its efforts in this

regard. The Council welcomes the Secretary-General's efforts to enhance the authority and accountability of senior United Nations representatives in carrying out their duties and responsibilities.

"The Security Council emphasizes the need for the United Nations system to strengthen strategic partnerships with the World Bank and other international financial institutions, and to complete by the end of 2009 the clarification of roles and responsibilities for key peacebuilding needs and to keep these under regular review, so that the appropriate expertise is generated to achieve a timely and predictable response.

"The Security Council recalls its resolution 1645 (2005) and recognizes the important role of the Peacebuilding Commission in promoting and supporting an integrated and coherent approach to peacebuilding, welcomes the progress it has achieved, calls on it to further enhance its advisory role and support for countries on its agenda and looks forward to the recommendations of the 2010 review of the Commission's founding resolutions on how its role can continue to be enhanced.

"The Security Council recognizes the critical importance of rapid, flexible and predictable funding for post-conflict peacebuilding. The Council urges Member States to help achieve this, building on the recommendations of the report and in particular increasing the impact of the Peacebuilding Fund, improving donor practices to make funding faster and more flexible and making use of in-country multi-donor trust funds, which are designed to accommodate the funding requirements of donors.

"The Security Council reaffirms that ending impunity is essential if a society recovering from conflict is to come to terms with past abuses committed against civilians affected by armed conflict and to prevent future such abuses. The Council notes that justice and reconciliation mechanisms can promote not only individual responsibility for serious crimes, but also peace, truth, reconciliation and the rights of victims.

"The Security Council, in accordance with its resolutions 1325 (2000) and 1820 (2008), underlines the key role women and young persons can play in re-establishing the fabric of society and stresses the need for their involvement in the development and implementation of post-conflict strategies in order to take account of their perspectives and needs.

"The Security Council reaffirms the role of regional and subregional organizations in the prevention, management and resolution of conflicts in accordance with Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations, and the need to strengthen their capacity in post-conflict peacebuilding.

"The Security Council recognizes the importance of launching peacebuilding assistance at the earliest possible stage. The Council affirms the importance of early consideration of peacebuilding in its own deliberations and of ensuring coherence between peacemaking, peacekeeping, peacebuilding and development to achieve an early and effective response to post-conflict situations. The Council will strive to apply this integrated approach and requests the Secretary-General to intensify his efforts in this regard.

"The Security Council invites the Secretary-General to report within 12 months to the Security Council and the General Assembly on progress achieved in fulfilling his agenda for action to improve the United Nations peacebuilding efforts, taking into consideration the views of the Peacebuilding Commission."

This statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/2009/23.

There are no further speakers inscribed on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.